

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

PRIVATE

ENDC/PV.22

17 April 1962

ENGLISH

THE UNIVERSITY,
OF MICHIGAN

FEB 15 1963

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 17 April 1962, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. LALL

(India)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. RODRIGUES RIBAS
Mr. ASSUMPCAO de ARAUJO
Mr. de ALENCAR ARARIPE

Bulgaria:

Mr. M. TARABANOV
Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. N. MINTCHEV
Mr. G. GUELEV

Burma:

Mr. J. BARRINGTON
U Tin MAUNG
U Aye LWIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. J.E.G. HARDY
Mr. J.F.M. BELL
Mr. R.M. TAIT

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. J. HAJEK
Mr. M. ZEMLA
Mr. E. PEPICH
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. P. SAHLOU
Mr. M. HAMID
Mr. A. MANDEFRO

India:

Mr. A.S. LALL
Mr. A.S. MEHTA
Mr. K.K. RAO
Mr. C.K. GAIROLA

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. C. COSTA-RIGHINI
Mr. F. LUCIOLI OTTIERI
Mr. P. TOZZOLI

Mexico:

Mr. L. PADILLA NERVO
Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG
Miss E. AGUIRRE
Mr. D. GONZALEZ

Nigeria:

Mr. A.A. ATTA
Mr. L.C.N. OBI

Poland:

Mr. M. NASZKOWSKI
Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN
Mr. M. BIEN
Mr. W. WIECZOREK

Romania:

Mr. G. MACOVESCU
Mr. M. MALITZA
Mr. C. SANDRU
Mr. E. GLASER

Sweden:

Mrs. A. MYRDAL
Baron C.H. von PLATEN
Mr. H. BLIX
Mr. B. FRIEDMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. V.A. ZORIN
Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN
Mr. V.N. ZHEREBTSOV

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (cont'd)

United Arab Republic:

Mr. A.F. HASSAN
Mr. A. EL-ERIAN
Mr. M.S. AHMED
Mr. S. ABDEL-HAMID

United Kingdom:

Mr. J.B. GODBER
Sir Michael WRIGHT
Mr. J.S.H. SHATTOCK
Mr. J.H. LAMBERT

United States of America:

Mr. A.H. DEAN
Mr. C.C. STELLE
Mr. R.I. SPIERS
Mr. S.H. McINTYRE

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. O. LOUTFI

Deputy to the Special Representative
of the Secretary-General:

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (India): I declare open the twenty-second meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I am very happy to be able to inform the Conference that since our last meeting on 10 April Mr. Zorin and I, as your co-Chairmen, have reached a very substantial measure of agreement on the working draft of the preamble to the treaty. There are only two exceptions, which I will mention later. This working draft has been circulated as document ENDC/L.11, and I am sure all representatives have it before them. The Conference will be relieved to know that I do not intend to make a long statement on this matter today, but there do remain two major points of difference, despite the very wide area of agreement, which require some discussion. Before dealing with these major points, however, I should like to call attention specifically to two or three other changes which I think merit some explanation.

The first point I would like to mention is my agreement -- ad referendum to my Government, of course -- to delete the word "basic" from the title we have given to the preamble and from the last paragraph of the preamble -- that is, the present last paragraph, paragraph 16. On 10 April I pointed out that Mr. Zorin and I were in agreement that what we have before us -- that is, the Soviet draft treaty (ENDC/2) and the United States plan of 25 September on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world (ENCD/6) -- are both blueprints. From these we are seeking to develop a basic treaty, that is, the main core of a treaty which can then be expanded by means of annexes. While in the interest of reaching agreement with our Soviet colleagues we have agreed to drop the word "basic", I want it to be clear that this in no sense alters our concept of the task ahead of us, which is to work out a basic treaty on general and complete disarmament. I feel it important, therefore, that the record indicate that in dropping the word "basic" we have in no way changed our view as to the character of our task or of the document on which we are working.

The second point I would like to make is in connexion with paragraph 11, a paragraph suggested by the representative of India. The co-Chairmen have agreed on one small but important change in that paragraph, a change which reflects a very good suggestion made by the representative of Brazil. He pointed out that in document ENDC/L.8 the words "economic well-being" imply "material well-being", and he suggested the substitution of "cultural progress" for the latter phrase.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

We believe that the suggestion of the representative of Brazil to include a reference to "cultural" was excellent, and I have no doubt that it will be acceptable to the representative of India, our Chairman today, who is in his own right a distinguished author.

The third point to which I would like to call attention is the agreement we have reached which is embodied in paragraphs 7 and 8 of our new draft preamble (ENDC/L.11). These paragraphs constitute the compromise we have reached in our discussion of paragraph 7 and paragraph 8 and combined paragraphs 7 and 8 in document ENDC/L.7. Paragraph 7 in our new agreement reflects, I believe, the kind of disarmament we all are seeking: general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control and accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. It is this kind of disarmament to which we refer in paragraph 8 of the draft of our preamble before the Conference today, when it suggests that "general and complete disarmament under strict international control is a sure and practical way to fulfil mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth." It seems to me that this is another way of saying "in a peaceful world", a point to which I shall revert later.

The central thought which I am attempting to convey in explaining these two paragraphs is that general and complete disarmament is not our only goal, nor will it, I submit, alone, by itself, assure us the free, secure and peaceful world we seek. We all want this kind of world and I hope we are going to get it. But the United States believes that general and complete disarmament must be accomplished by a progressive strengthening of the capacity of the United Nations for peace-keeping.

This point brings me to a discussion of the two major areas of difference which remain between the co-Chairmen. These areas of difference are indicated by their inclusion in parenthesis in the new working draft of the preamble (ENDC/L.11). As may be seen from a study of that draft, the Soviet Union objects to the inclusion of the phrase "in a peaceful world" in the title of the preamble. It also objects to the inclusion of that phrase in paragraph 14 and in paragraph 16. In all candour I must emphasize the seriousness with which the United States views these objections, despite our very large area of agreement.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

Indeed, I find it difficult to understand just why the representative of the Soviet Union should object to "general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world" in the title and in paragraph 16 of the preamble. I find it even more surprising that the representative of the Soviet Union wishes to remove this phrase from paragraph 14 of the preamble. This paragraph, as I am sure representatives will recognize, is a direct quotation of the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961, which reads as follows:

"Affirming that to facilitate the attainment of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world it is important that all States abide by existing international agreements, refrain from any actions which might aggravate international tensions, and that they seek settlement of all disputes by peaceful means," (ENDC/5).

Surely this is no time for retrogression. Surely this is no time to raise questions about the very basis of our discussions. The Statement of Agreed Principles of 20 September 1961 was negotiated most carefully, line by line, and indeed word by word, by Mr. McCloy and myself with Mr. Zorin. It has been endorsed unanimously by the General Assembly as the basis for our discussion here. I trust and hope it is not now being challenged; if it is, we will no longer have, I submit, a basis on which to continue our very important disarmament discussions -- the discussions upon which our own hopes and the hopes of mankind now rest.

I very much hope, therefore, that the representative of the Soviet Union will reconsider his position on this important matter. In suggesting that the words "in a peaceful world" be left out of the title of the preamble and paragraphs 14 and 16, Mr. Zorin, it seems to me, is questioning a vital element in the basis of our discussions, on which there must continue to be agreement if we are to make the kind of disarmament progress for which we are all striving here.

The second major point of disagreement relates to paragraph 15. That paragraph reads:

"(Declaring their goal to be a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent States adhering to common standards of international conduct, a world where change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter;)" (ENDC/L.11, page 2).

The Soviet Union has objected to including this paragraph on two grounds: first, that it is unnecessary and duplicates points made in other parts of the preamble; and secondly, that it contains the phrase "a world where change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter".

(Mr. Dean, United States)

We believe that it is important that the preamble contain a goal. We believe that the very small amount of repetition which now remains in our suggested statement of the goal is desirable. We furthermore believe that it is important to make reference to the problem of change. Certainly, we neither expect, nor want, the world to remain static. We would hope that man would continue to strive to improve his material, cultural, and spiritual well-being. In these efforts we would expect to see change take place. No one, of course, can foresee the direction of such change, but no one can deny that in the very nature of things, change is inevitable, and it must be foreseen, for even with general and complete disarmament no one expects the world to remain as it is today.

As the representative of India indicated, there is no intent in our inclusion of this reference to "change" to suggest interference in the domestic affairs of nations. Indeed, it is for that reason that we have suggested as the criterion that change be "in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter". That Charter gives full and adequate protection against any fear of internal interference which my colleague from the Soviet Union may harbour. As representatives know, Article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter states:

"Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State ...".

In accordance with another suggestion by the representative of India, I also proposed that we might put paragraph 15, with some appropriate changes in the wording, at the end of paragraph 3 so as to bring the statement of the goal up to an earlier part of the preamble. This might possibly read:

"Desiring to create conditions in which all people can strive to fulfil their just aspirations in a free, secure and peaceful world of independent States adhering to common standards of international conduct and in a world where change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter."

This is the substance of paragraph 15, transferred to the end of paragraph 3.

Let me be very clear: I do want to thank Mr. Zorin and his colleagues for their helpful and co-operative attitude throughout these discussions. I believe we have achieved a very wide area of agreement despite the two remaining areas of disagreement which I have outlined. I really think we can congratulate ourselves on the degree of progress we have made in arriving at this working draft of a

(Mr. Dean, United States)

preamble. Of course, we do not consider our work to be ended; as your co-Chairmen, we are submitting the draft for the Conference's consideration. But I think we have reached a point where we might profitably pause in our work on that problem and turn our attention to other elements in the preparation of a basic treaty for general and complete disarmament. At some point we will want to review the work we have done on the preamble in the light of the agreement we reached on other parts of the treaty.

In the meantime, I presume my colleagues will want to keep in mind the possibility of further refinements in this working draft of the preamble at a later date. I am sure that they as well as we will want to make further constructive contributions towards making our preamble a fitting statement for the far-reaching agreement the world expects to emerge from our discussions. It is a working draft submitted ad referendum and it is open to change, but I did want to report this very wide area of agreement between the two co-Chairmen.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): The co-Chairmen have submitted an agreed text of a draft preamble of the treaty on general and complete disarmament, indicating two points on which agreement has not been reached. Agreement was not reached on the words "in a peaceful world" which appear both in the heading itself and in several paragraphs of the text of the draft. As I have already said, they appear not only in the heading but in paragraphs 14 and 16 of the preamble. Agreement was also not reached on paragraph 15 of the preamble, which our delegation is not alone in opposing. Before discussing these two points, on which I believe it is essential to restate our position, I should like to draw attention to several remarks made just now by the representative of the United States, Mr. Dean, in explaining the position of his country and in interpreting individual provisions of this agreed preamble.

I note that the United States delegation still adheres to its view that there should be not a single draft treaty, but, to use that delegation's words, a basic draft treaty or basic treaty, and that there should be additional documents. I draw attention to this, because in our further work on the treaty, we shall clearly come up against this attitude of the United States which, in our view, is a definite obstacle to further agreement on the draft treaty. But as the United States has now dropped its formula, we shall continue to base our work on the text now before us in the agreed draft preamble.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The second remark I would like to make refers to the construction placed on the agreed paragraphs 7 and 8, dealing with general and complete disarmament.

In explaining these two paragraphs, the representative of the United States, as I understood him from the simultaneous interpretation, first said that paragraph 7 provides that "disarmament must be general and complete under strict and effective international control" and that "such disarmament must be accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter" (ENDC/L.11).

Mr. Dean then went on to say, in connexion with paragraph 8, that his delegation regarded "this kind of" general and complete disarmament under strict international control "as a sure and practical way to fulfil mankind's age-old dream of ensuring perpetual and inviolable peace on earth" (ENDC/L.11). This particular interpretation - namely, that the reference is to "such" disarmament and that paragraphs 7 and 8 are inter-connected and interdependent - is not the one we agreed upon.

Furthermore, when we were discussing this question, the United States delegation proposed that this word "such" should be included in paragraph 8; it proposed the use of the phrase "such general and complete disarmament", but we did not agree to this. We raised objections, and the United States delegation did not insist on the word "such". Yet, in commenting on this paragraph 8 today, the United States delegation still interprets it as referring to "such" disarmament. We consider that this conflicts with the interpretation we agreed upon. We regard this as an important point, although it relates only to the single word "such".

Why is this? We consider that general and complete disarmament is in itself a sure and practical way to ensure perpetual and inviolable peace on earth. By this we mean general and complete disarmament, not qualified by any prior conditions. Any attempt to lay down prior conditions of this kind would, in our opinion, jeopardize the actual implementation of general and complete disarmament, since it would imply the existence of predetermined measures and conditions which must be fulfilled before general and complete disarmament could begin. We consider this approach to be incorrect, since it would be tantamount to hampering the process of general and complete disarmament by laying down specific conditions which might be an obstacle to its actual implementation. That is why we consider it impossible to specify in paragraph 8 that the reference is to such general and complete disarmament as that dealt with in paragraph 7.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

What we consider absolutely essential is that general and complete disarmament should be carried out under strict international control. This we do believe. It is disarmament of this kind which is a sure and practical way to ensure perpetual and inviolable peace. With regard to the establishment of reliable procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, general and complete disarmament must indeed be accompanied by these peaceful reliable procedures and effective arrangements. This is true. We are in favour of this. But this is not a prior condition for the implementation of general and complete disarmament. This difference of interpretation has a certain significance and I think that in our further discussion of a number of questions, we may be confronted with this somewhat different approach to the actual interpretation of general and complete disarmament.

Our differences of opinion on the words "in a peaceful world" turn on almost the same issue, approached, so to speak, from the opposite angle. The United States delegation insists that the words "in a peaceful world" should be added in all cases where reference is made to general and complete disarmament.

The USSR delegation considers it undesirable to include these words in the preamble to the treaty, since that would create the impression that general and complete disarmament can be carried into effect only when all outstanding controversial issues have been settled. To qualify disarmament by imposing such conditions would quite obviously place obstacles in the path of the actual practical settlement of the disarmament problem, since there are always some outstanding controversial issues in the world. The whole problem is to create conditions for the peaceful settlement of these issues. If we await the settlement of all controversial issues before solving the problem of general and complete disarmament, we may create a situation in which a solution of the disarmament problem will meet with unnecessary and artificial obstacles.

For these reasons, we consider it undesirable to make the establishment of a "peaceful world" a prerequisite for the solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament. Those are our reasons for objecting to the insertion of the words "in a peaceful world" in the preamble. These words were admittedly used in the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles, but that does not purport to be a final draft of the treaty.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The Soviet delegation also objects to the inclusion in the draft preamble of the paragraph 15 proposed by the United States. This paragraph is a slightly modified version of paragraph 14 of the earlier draft preamble which was submitted to the Committee on 10 April (ENDC/L.7). We have already had an opportunity of explaining our objections to this paragraph. We pointed out that the first clause of this paragraph is a repetition of provisions already contained in paragraphs 3, 6, 13 and 14 of the agreed draft preamble. We also indicated that the second clause of this paragraph 15, which states that our goal is "a world where change takes place in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter," is, in our opinion, incorrect in substance.

We have already pointed out that fundamental changes are taking place in the world. The United States representative has also referred to this point today. These changes are connected, on the one hand, with the liberation of former colonial peoples from colonial dependency and the creation of new independent States and, on the other, with far-reaching social and economic changes resulting from the natural historical process of the revolutionary transformation of society in accordance with the interests and wishes of the popular masses fighting for their national and social emancipation. It would, therefore, be quite unrealistic to suppose that all these processes can be contained within any predetermined legal framework. If this course were to be adopted, it would mean that we were trying to interfere in the domestic affairs of peoples and to impede natural historical processes taking place in society. We cannot agree to this.

It should be noted that, during the Committee's discussion of the draft preamble on 10 April, many delegations expressed certain doubts about the desirability of including the present paragraph 15 - it was then paragraph 14 - in the draft preamble. I recall that the representative of Canada, Mr. Burns, stated that his delegation had some doubt whether this paragraph is really necessary (ENDC/PV.17, page 24). Doubts were also expressed by the representative of Ethiopia, who pointed out that States and peoples all over the world have different concepts and standards of justice and that it might therefore be inadvisable to include the ideas contained in paragraph 15 (then paragraph 14) in the form in which they are expressed in that paragraph (ibid., page 34).

The representative of India, Mr. Lall, also expressed doubts, and so did Mr. Godber, who associated himself with the representative of Ethiopia. The Soviet delegation, for reasons which we have already given at a previous meeting and

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

which I have just briefly restated, considers it undesirable to retain the present paragraph 15, which, as I have already pointed out, both duplicates provisions already contained in the preamble --this has incidentally been admitted by Mr. Dean today -- and contains a provision, the substance of which is such that no one who believes in the progressive development of society can agree to include it in the draft preamble.

This is why we could not agree to the inclusion of this paragraph in the draft preamble.

Despite these differences, we consider that the agreement we have reached on the remaining paragraphs -- in fact, on all the remaining paragraphs -- of the preamble to the treaty marks a definite advance, and we believe that we can go forward and begin to work out the obligations of States under the articles and parts of the treaty which set out these obligations, starting with article 1. We have already begun to discuss these questions, and I think that, if we adopt a co-operative attitude, we will be able to make further progress in preparing a draft treaty on general and complete disarmament which could serve as a document to which all the States of the world would affix their signatures.

Together with all members of our Committee, we shall press on with this work and try to overcome obstacles and differing approaches which might hamper agreement on this draft treaty. We base our position on the assumption that all States represented here are interested in facilitating the accomplishment of the primary task facing our Committee, and in being able to report considerable progress in this respect to the United Nations Disarmament Commission by 1 June.

We have agreed with the representative of the United States on a brief text which we propose should be included in the communique of today's meeting and which reads as follows:

"The co-Chairmen (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America) have reached, with the exceptions indicated in brackets, agreement on the preamble to the treaty which the Committee is drafting. The Committee approved the working draft preamble as so far developed by the co-Chairmen."

We propose that this text should be included in the communique of today's meeting.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I wish to thank the representative of Italy for yielding the floor to me so that I could make this very short statement.

I should like to confirm what the representative of the Soviet Union has said. It is quite correct that my delegation did suggest the addition of the word "such" before the words "general and complete disarmament" in paragraph 8 and that after discussion we agreed to the inclusion of paragraph 8 without the word "such".

My delegation believes that general and complete disarmament is sufficiently described, or characterized, in the preceding paragraph 7 to establish the link which we believe in fact exists. The Soviet delegation is of course perfectly free, as is any other delegation, to place its own interpretation upon these two paragraphs. This is what takes place in the course of trying to agree on a composite text. While I confirm what the representative of the Soviet Union has said, I also want to confirm the United States interpretation that there is a link and a connexion between the two paragraphs.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I should like first to express to the two co-Chairmen the great satisfaction of the Italian delegation at the progress they have made in drafting the preamble. Their efforts to reach a compromise have been very praiseworthy and very successful, and we appreciate these at their true value.

I should also like to thank the two co-Chairmen for the clear explanations they have given us this morning. In my opinion the preamble is a very important document -- a very important undertaking. It states a common determination of very great significance. The work we have yet to do will certainly be long and difficult, but by affirming this common determination in the preamble we assume a precise moral obligation to complete our task. The peoples of the world will know that we are assembled here for a serious task, the main lines of which we have already marked out. So we are on the right road.

Allow me once again to make a comparison with the work on disarmament in 1960. I remember, and Mr. Zorin will also remember, that we then failed, after two months' work and also before an Easter recess, to reach agreement on a press communique. Now, after one month's work, we have an important text on which agreement is almost complete. It is true there are still a few points on which we disagree, but I do not think they are serious.

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

I believe we all have the same idea of the world which will emerge after general and complete disarmament. We ourselves would particularly emphasize that in that world, from which all armaments will have been eliminated, a new order based on international law must prevail. Violence will be completely banished from it; violence, that plague of humanity which can manifest itself in armaments, subversion, insults and threats, will no longer be possible. The new world we have in mind cannot, it is true, be a static world. But although changes must take place by reason of the perpetual transformation of mankind, they will be carried out in conformity with international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. Every country, large or small, will have to conform to those principles. That will really be the great democracy of the nations, which, once disarmed, will all submit to the higher principles of international law and peaceful collaboration. These affirmations are not mere rhetoric; it is up to us to translate them into living realities.

That is why we are in favour of paragraph 15 of the preamble. We hope that the other delegations will also realize its importance. I really wonder what explanation we should give to our governments and our peoples if paragraph 15 were deleted. Might it not create a false impression? Might it not be misleading, and imply that we are against certain principles on which we are really in general agreement, even though some would prefer not to include them in the preamble or believe that they are already implicit in another part of it? We must therefore make a fresh effort to reach full agreement, which is, I think, in sight. I am sure we shall be willing to make that effort.

For my part, I wish to propose that we delete the words "in a peaceful world" from paragraphs 14 and 16, provided that they are retained in the title of the document and that the text of paragraph 15 remains unchanged.

I should also be prepared to agree to paragraph 15 being inserted in another part of the text, as Mr. Dean suggested.

Mr. MACOVESCU (Romania): I have already had the opportunity of speaking twice on the language of the preamble which we are now drafting. If I speak again for the third time on this matter, it is because I want to give expression to my delegation's feelings of sincere satisfaction at the agreement which has been reached by our co-Chairmen and by the Committee with respect to almost the whole of the preamble.

(Mr. Macovescu, (Romania))

In fact, after the first report of our co-Chairmen, of a total of sixteen paragraphs only seven were entirely agreed upon by all parties concerned. Now, with the exception of a part of the title, there is only one paragraph, namely paragraph 15, on which divergency still exists. I think this is evidence of considerable success.

This proves, first of all, that our working methods are right. They are of such a nature as to promote the narrowing of gaps, to bring opposing positions closer together, and to enable us to arrive at generally acceptable solutions with respect to the substance of problems as well as the wording of the text. There can be no doubt that if we continue in this way, with a mutual determination to achieve concrete results, our work will progress in a manner satisfactory to all those who have at heart the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament, the lessening of international tension and the ensuring of normal and friendly relations among nations.

Paragraph 15 casts, so to speak, a shadow on our picture. This paragraph was proposed by the United States delegation, and the Soviet delegation cannot agree to it for reasons which were made clear by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Zorin, with whom I personally fully agree. The same applies to the words "in a peaceful world" proposed by the United States delegation. Any such qualification of general and complete disarmament would mean, in the view of my delegation, conditioning the implementation of general and complete disarmament and would therefore constitute dangerous seeds of future disagreement.

It is not my intention to take up once more all or part of the reasons, well known to all of us, which, in our opinion, call for the exclusion of this paragraph and these words from the preamble. All I want to say is that what we have achieved in this respect up to now seems to me to have been fairly well done, and I think we would be wise not to try at this stage of our proceedings to arrive at a conclusion on these matters too. This is, as we all acknowledge, a sort of first reading of the treaty. Let us note, for the moment, our agreement on all other points, and leave for the second reading the task of considering once again the only questions upon which there are still divergent views. This will be all the easier since not even the Western Powers seem to consider paragraph 15, which was submitted by the United States delegation, to be of really vital importance. That at least is what I gathered from the remarks made on this point by the representative of Canada, Mr. Burns, who said:

(Mr. Macovescu, Romania)

"With regard to paragraph 14" -- which is now paragraph 15 --
 "we are in agreement with the ideas and sentiments expressed in this
 paragraph, but we have some doubt whether it is really necessary to
 include such a provision in a preamble." (ENDC/PV.17, page 25)

I should like to say that, if even those who favour the inclusion of
 paragraph 15 in the text of the preamble do not feel it is really necessary, there
 can be no doubt that we should not lose time on this question now. Therefore let
 us close this discussion for the time being, and let us note with satisfaction the
 agreement reached with respect to the overwhelming majority of the problems in
 connexion with the wording of the preamble by adopting the communique which has
 just been distributed to us. We may then proceed with our work on the rest of the
 treaty on general and complete disarmament.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I want to speak only briefly on this
 matter. First, I would congratulate our co-Chairmen on the measure of agreement
 they have reached. They themselves, quite naturally and with their usual modesty,
 have both referred to the points of difference, but I am sure that the rest of the
 representatives gathered here recognize the very large area of agreement they have
 reached, on which I think they should be congratulated. Certainly the work they
 have done together has borne fruit, and I think it is encouraging for our future
 work that this very large measure of agreement has been reached.

We understand that our co-Chairmen propose that we adopt this document as
 submitted to us with the two or three unagreed points left for later discussion.
 I think that is a wise suggestion and possibly, as our discussions continue in the
 coming weeks, the points which now seem to cause particular difficulty here may
 not loom so large in the thoughts of representatives as we go along. It may
 therefore be that when we come back to confirm this document at a later stage we
 may find it easier to agree on these particular matters. I listened to the reasons
 given by both our co-Chairmen this morning, and probably will not wholly surprise
 my colleagues if I say that I found the arguments adduced by our United States
 colleague a little more convincing than those adduced by our Soviet colleague.

I could see the substance in the points made on both sides, but I did think
 our Soviet colleague was making rather heavy weather of the reference to a peaceful
 world. It did not seem to me to carry with it the same implications to which he
 drew attention. You yourself, Mr. Chairman, when we discussed this matter before,

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

suggested a slight amendment of the words; I think you suggested "for" a peaceful world. That was a suggestion which might have commended itself to our co-Chairmen and perhaps in course of time it will. But at any rate it seems to me that some reference in the title and in at least one of these other places to a peaceful world would certainly not be out of place, particularly since, as our United States colleague reminded us, it does appear in exactly the same terms in the Agreed Principles. However, let us leave it there for the moment.

As regards paragraph 15, I personally would like to see this retained. I think the idea of a goal is helpful and, I would have thought, encouraging. Again, I was not really convinced by the arguments adduced against it. Mr. Zorin in commenting on this, referred to the fact that I myself had had certain doubts in regard to the corresponding paragraph, paragraph 14, in the earlier draft. Of course, the wording has been amended very considerably to take account of the ideas which were then expressed by, I think, our colleague from Ethiopia and in which I saw some point at the time. I find this new wording much more agreeable. Actually, may I remind my colleagues that when I referred to this paragraph on the previous occasion, 10 April, I said, after making certain comments in regard to this paragraph in its then form, which was considerably more explicit than the present text:

"Generally speaking, I think this paragraph is a helpful one and, with certain amendments to take account of what has been suggested here this morning, it could indeed be useful." (ENDC/PV.17, page 41)

Therefore, even at that time, in its then form, I felt it was valuable. I think it is probably more valuable in its present form. However, as there is this difference of opinion on it I think it is probably right that we should leave it on one side now and revert to it at a later stage when we have made more progress in the drafting of the treaty as a whole.

I therefore commend the proposal put to us by our co-Chairmen. If we cannot have a peaceful world, it is at any rate in a peaceful Committee here in this room that I think we shall make progress. I welcome this and would like to add my thanks to the co-Chairmen for having submitted to us a form of words about this matter for inclusion in the communique today.

When our Soviet colleague suggested (ibid., page 48) that we should express some commendation of the preamble, I objected that it was difficult for us to agree to such procedures unless something was submitted to us in writing (ibid., page 47). I am most appreciative of the fact that our co-Chairmen have taken note

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

of this suggestion and that we now have before us a clear form of words. I think that does facilitate our decisions on any incorporations in the communique. I welcome this, and certainly will endorse the suggestion that this paragraph be added to our communique today.

May I make one further suggestion? Having reached this large area of agreement on the preamble, having decided -- this is on the assumption that we shall decide -- to include this paragraph in our communique, would it not be logical also to include, as an appendix to the communique or in some other form, the actual draft of the preamble in the state in which we have agreed it, so that in fact we do publish the wording of the preamble in its present form? I think it might be an encouragement to those who study our work to see that we have reached this measure of agreement.

The CHAIRMAN (India): Are there any other speakers on the preamble? Since I see none, I should like to make a few remarks as the representative of India.

We should like to say that it gives us great pleasure to see the scope of agreement reached by the two co-Chairmen. We agree that this matter could be left as it is for the present until we come back to the preamble at a later stage of our work.

I should like to raise one very small drafting point on paragraph 5 in document ENDC/L.11. It concerns the use of the word "but" in the second line of that paragraph. I should have thought the word should be "and". It is not a very large point but apparently the co-Chairmen are still pondering over it. I should have thought that clearly the word should be "and", but I leave it at that and perhaps they can look at it later.

The second point to which I should like to refer is the draft for the communique. I entirely agree with the representative of the United Kingdom that if the draft is to remain in this form this Committee, as master of its own procedure, should circulate with the communique the text on which agreement has been reached. If that is not agreed to, then we shall have to make a slight change for purposes of logical presentation in this document which has now been presented for the draft communique.

May I take it, in my capacity as Chairman, that it is agreed that with the draft communique we should make available document ENDC/L.11, showing the bracketed portions?

It was so decided.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, the comment you made today on paragraph 5 in your capacity as the representative of India is quite acceptable to us. We even consider it more logical to substitute the word "and" for "but" in the English text and to make a corresponding change in the Russian text. If the United States representative has no objection, we could perhaps issue this revised version of paragraph 5.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I was hoping that our Chairman for today, with his great grasp of both style and the English language, would make some suggestions. I happily acquiesce in the elimination of "but" and the inclusion of "and".

The CHAIRMAN (India): Thank you, Mr. Dean, for saying that so courteously. We shall then include paragraph 5 in that form.^{1/}

We shall now pass to our second item, which is the question of nuclear tests.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): As all our colleagues know, the representatives of the eight new members of this Committee yesterday tabled a memorandum (ENDC/28) on the question of nuclear testing. In accordance with my brief statement yesterday, I have referred this document to my Government for study. I wish to reiterate this morning that my delegation welcomes this initiative, as indeed we will welcome any new ideas or approaches which might help us to overcome the impasse which we appear to have reached on this most vital problem.

I am not at this point prepared to make any detailed comment on this memorandum, but in order to assist my Government in its understanding and study of the document I wish to seek clarification on a number of important points.

First, I should like to note with gratification that the eight-Power proposal alludes to the establishing of a system for control "on a purely scientific non-political basis" (ENDC/28, paragraph 3). My delegation could not agree more with this observation. Also we are most gratified to note that the suggestion contemplates the establishment of an "international" system. This has been the very point my delegation has often urged. If these two principles were to be accepted once more by the Soviet Union we could approach our work in this area with renewed

^{1/} The revised text was circulated as ENDC/L.11/Rev.1

(Mr. Dean, United States)

hope and some confidence of success. I assume that the eight new members of this Committee intend that the ideas suggested in the new paper should be considered on this scientific basis.

I shall not ask many questions today. I must, of course, reserve the right to seek additional clarification at future meetings, clarification which I have been assured any of the eight co-sponsors would be only too happy to give.

1. With respect to the control posts, the co-sponsors suggest, as I understand it, that a system "... be based and built upon already existing national networks of observation posts and institutions ..." (ENDC/28, paragraph 3). My question is: Have the sponsors of this proposal made a scientific assessment of the detection capabilities of presently-existing posts and institutions with respect to atmospheric tests, underwater tests, outer-space tests and underground tests?

2. In the light of this assessment, what is the view of the authors of the document regarding the necessity of the establishment of new control posts by agreement? Do they presently have a view on the standard which should be used for spacing and for equipping such additional posts, on the need for a global network, and on whether certain gaps in coverage of such posts would be acceptable -- that is, how would this affect the scientific efficiency of the system?

3. In regard to new stations which might be built by agreement, is it the intention of the sponsors that these would be incorporated into existing national systems or operated internationally?

4. The sponsors state that: "Improvements could no doubt be achieved by furnishing posts with more advanced instrumentation." (ibid.) I should like to know whether the sponsors have developed any scientific ideas or views with regard to the nature of this new instrumentation and how this might improve the capabilities of the system contemplated, both as to detection and as to identification.

5. The memorandum speaks of an international commission "... entrusted with the tasks of processing all data received from the agreed system of observation posts ..." (ibid., paragraph 4) My question is: Have the co-sponsors given any consideration to what would be required, in terms of personnel, equipment and finances for the system, to process data received on a uniform and accurate basis?

6. Would binding commitments be undertaken by the parties to the treaty regularly to furnish data of a uniform scientific character to the international commission? Have the co-sponsors gone into the question of how rapidly these

(Mr. Dean, United States)

data would be acquired by the international commission and by what means of communication they would be transmitted? Would this international commission have its own set of communications or would it use national systems of communication? How would these data be communicated?

7. What rights would the international commission have to co-ordinate the operations of the different observation stations, whether national or international, in order to make sure that they were operated during the same hours and with adequate personnel? Would this commission have the right to set and enforce standards of operation and equipment? Precisely what would its powers be with respect to these operating standards and the type of equipment, and what measures would the international commission adopt to prevent possible falsification, manipulation or omission of data from national stations, or negligence or carelessness in the operation of those national stations resulting in the commission's failing to get these data on a regular scientific basis?

8. The memorandum submitted by our eight colleagues also proposes that all parties "... accept the obligation to furnish the Commission with the facts necessary to establish the nature of any suspicious and significant event."

(ENDC/28, paragraph 4) My question is: Do the co-sponsors have a definition of what would constitute a "suspicious and significant event", and if so what is that definition? Do the co-sponsors feel that there is anything about an unidentified event which makes it suspicious apart from the mere fact that it is unidentified by distant instrumentation? Does the word "significant" indicate some particular standard to be set by the commission for a decision regarding significance?

9. What are the facts which will establish the nature of a suspicious event? If we take, for example, an unidentified seismic event. Are there any facts which would provide convincing evidence of the nature of an unidentified seismic event, without an on-site inspection?

10. If the international commission found that the nature of a "suspicious and significant event" in the underground environment could be established only by the facts obtainable as a result of an on-site inspection, would each party's obligation to furnish such facts to the commission mean that in such cases the party had an obligation to arrange for the necessary on-site inspection? In other words, would there be some circumstances in which a party would have an obligation under the treaty to permit an on-site inspection, or would the country on whose territory the unidentified event was supposed to have taken place always have to

(Mr. Dean, United States)

make a voluntary offer to permit an inspection under paragraph 4 of the memorandum? Would the on-site inspection be conducted by the international commission itself, or would it be entrusted to the nationals of the country on whose territory the unidentified event took place?

11. What is the relationship between the procedures outlined in paragraph 4 and in paragraph 5? These give some impression of overlapping. Could a party to the treaty refuse on-site inspection for a sufficiently long period of time to cover up the traces of a secret nuclear test? According to the 1958 experts' report (EXP/NUC/28), such inspection would normally have to take place between the fifth and the twentieth day, since otherwise radioactive debris might appear or be very difficult to separate or find.

12. Paragraph 5 speaks of consultation between the party on whose territory the event occurred and the international commission. Does this paragraph establish an obligation to accept an on-site inspection if the commission, after consultation with the party on whose territory the event occurs, finds such an inspection to be essential to acquire the facts about an event, as provided in paragraph 4? What would be the voting procedures in the international commission?

13. Is paragraph 5 intended to imply that any party to the treaty could denounce the agreement if another party refused to co-operate in the furnishing of data or if, although the latter co-operated in furnishing data, the results of the inquiry were nevertheless inconclusive?

I did not find anything in the memorandum as to the plans for operating the outer space or the underground equipment. I do not know how it is intended that the rather substantial expenses involved should be apportioned.

An indication of the views of the eight new members on the questions I have asked would be of very great assistance to my Government in evaluating the significance and nature of the suggestions which have been put before us. I have attempted today to limit my questions to very basic matters which seem to me to go to the very heart of the type of international control system which is contemplated.

There are many other points which I am sure would occur to other governments represented here, as well as to my own Government, relating to such matters as operating procedures, the nature of the staffing arrangements, the co-ordination of languages, the co-ordination of machinery, how the machinery is to be manufactured, how the staffs are to be trained, and so forth. But these questions can perhaps wait. Our further questions would, of course, depend on the answers to the somewhat elementary preliminary questions which I have put today. My Government, as I say, is studying this matter and I fully expect to be speaking on it again very soon.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I also have been studying this most important proposal with very great care, and I have submitted it to my Government for consideration. As I indicated yesterday, it would not be possible really at this stage to make considered comments in relation to the proposal, and I shall hope to have the opportunity of doing so shortly. However, I also indicated yesterday that I thought it likely that I should have certain questions when I had had time to study this document in detail. Indeed I had formulated a number of questions, but by the time my United States colleague had finished his list of questions I found I had to cross out nearly all of mine. Therefore I have not now got a very impressive list of questions to put. These are only initial questions; no doubt we shall have other points. But perhaps I could just briefly refer to one or two points which I do not think were fully covered by my United States colleague.

In regard to the question of inspections which would take place within the framework of the proposals enumerated here, I am not quite clear as to whether the sponsors of this proposal envisage any limitation on these inspections. In other words, are they considering an annual quota of inspections? I am sure our colleagues are well aware that this point was the object of a good deal of discussion in our earlier consideration of this matter. I am not clear as to what is the intention of the sponsors in regard to this particular point.

My United States colleague did just touch on the question of the outer space and underwater environments. I would ask the sponsors of this proposal whether they foresee the need for detection systems to cover those two environments. Their proposals in paragraph 3 make most interesting reading. They make various suggestions as to how the existing arrangements -- "existing national networks", as they refer to them -- could be expanded and extended. I was rather interested to see that they say that "Such a system might be based and built upon already existing national networks". This implies a very considerable extension of existing networks, and I think that it is clear in all the proposals that have been made that something of this kind is necessary. But, as I say, the memorandum does not refer to detection under water or in outer space. I take it that the sponsors of the proposal would wish to cover these environments as well. This is another point on which I should be glad to have some information.

Still on paragraph 3, I see it is stated that "The existing networks already include in their scientific endeavours the detection and identification of man-made explosions". The word "endeavours" is an interesting one, and I am sure it was very

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

carefully chosen. I think it does indicate some of the difficulties and the imponderables in this matter. In this connexion I might recall to my colleagues that yesterday, when I first heard the proposal, I did comment on this aspect.

I said:

"Perhaps it might be helpful, and I just suggest it as an idea, if scientific experts of those of the sponsoring States which have such experts -- and some of them, I know, have very distinguished experts in the nuclear and seismic fields -- could talk with scientists of the nuclear Powers on possible improvements in an international system." (ENDC/PV.21, page 23)

I was thinking then of paragraph 3 of this joint memorandum. I would reiterate the thought that if in fact there are ideas which could help to clarify the position in this field it would be helpful to us in our discussions to have them. For my own part I would welcome such expert advice being given to the experts of the existing nuclear Powers.

Another point which did not seem to be quite clear in regard to the proposed inspection teams which are provided for in paragraphs 4 and 5 concerns the composition of those inspection teams. What do the sponsors envisage as being the composition, by nationality, of these teams? Perhaps we could have a little clarification on that.

Then in paragraph 5 of the joint memorandum we read:

"Should the commission find that it was unable to reach a conclusion on the nature of a significant event it would so inform the party on whose territory that event had occurred ..."

If this happens, it sets in train a course of events; but I am not quite clear from paragraph 5 whether this would happen always and only on the initiative of the commission itself. In other words, if one of the parties to the treaty felt that there was need for action in this field, would it be in a position, by questioning or by drawing attention to certain facts which were available to it, to ask the commission to initiate any particular action in this field? I think this would require spelling out a good deal more.

These are just certain points on which it is desired to have clarification; we are merely seeking to find out exactly what is in the minds of those who have put together this most interesting proposal. As I have indicated, I shall hope to have the opportunity of making substantive comments; I have referred the matter to my

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

Government and it would be premature for me to make such comments now. All I would say, again, is that it is clear that our colleagues from the countries concerned have spent a great deal of time and thought in the preparation of this document. Obviously certain difficulties do emerge, but if we can be absolutely clear on some of the points which have been referred to, it will help us in considering this matter further and in trying to find a solution, which I am sure we are all seeking to achieve.

Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma): On behalf of the eight delegations that co-sponsored the memorandum on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests which was presented to the Committee yesterday, I should like to thank delegations here, and particularly the delegations of the three nuclear Powers, for the friendly and appreciative reception they have given the memorandum. The statements we have heard this morning confirm the deep and friendly interest which these delegations have taken in our memorandum, and we wish to express our appreciation for this. I should like to assure these representatives that we shall give the most careful and earnest attention and consideration to the questions which have been formulated in these statements and shall make available our replies at a subsequent meeting of this Committee. However, I wonder whether it might not help to facilitate consideration if the delegations that have put questions gave us their questions in writing. I note with appreciation that the United States delegation has, in effect, already done this by providing us with copies of Mr. Dean's statement of this morning.^{1/} Perhaps it would be helpful all around if the United Kingdom delegation could do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN (India): A suggestion has been made by the representative of Burma that the questions which have been put regarding the joint memorandum before us in document ENDC/28 should be submitted in writing. May I take it that the authors of the questions will do this?

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): We will do our best. I do not actually have my questions in writing; I posed them as I went through the document. In any case, of course, my questions will appear in the verbatim record of today's meeting. But I will do my best to comply with the request.

^{1/} The questions submitted by the delegation of the United States with respect to the Eight Power Joint Memorandum have been circulated in document ENDC/29.

The CHAIRMAN (India): I take it that we can leave it that the questions will be put in writing.

Does anyone wish to speak on any other matters today?

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): Yesterday the representative of Canada asked for information from the co-Chairmen on the progress they had made on selecting the next agenda item or items for consideration in the Committee of the Whole. I should be happy to report on that matter now.

My co-Chairman and I have had a number of meetings on this point and we have spent considerable time on it. Although I think we have probably delineated the points at issue much more clearly -- at least in our own minds -- I am sorry to say that at this point the only agreement that my co-Chairman, the representative of the Soviet Union, and I have been able to reach, apart from the agreement we had previously reached on the discussion of the item of the cessation of war propaganda, is that we should return to the Committee of the Whole for a further discussion and clarification of views on what measures might next be discussed by that Committee. On behalf of my delegation, I can assure members that we are most anxious to proceed with our discussions.

As my colleagues will recall from our earlier discussions of which items are to be considered in the Committee of the Whole, document ENDC/C.I/2 presented the views of the two co-Chairmen on the first item of the agenda and noted certain other proposals which had been put forward for consideration. Also, as I pointed out in my statement in the Committee of the Whole on 5 April, the principal objective of the United States is

"to move our discussions forward as rapidly as possible to the central, fundamental and substantive issues of disarmament." (ENDC/C.I/PV.2,
page 12)

I explained at that time that in our view the cessation of war propaganda, although it was an item we could agree upon, was probably not the most important item. Nevertheless, to move our negotiations along and in a spirit of accommodation and to avoid delays, my delegation agreed with the Soviet delegation to discuss, as the first priority item, one chosen from the list proposed by the Soviet Union.

However, we made clear when the co-Chairmen presented their first report to the Committee of the Whole that we hoped to have one recommendation drawn from the list proposed by the Soviet Union and one drawn from the list proposed by the other side; this is why we agreed to list the possible agenda items in parallel columns.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

It still seems to us that this is a reasonable viewpoint. We feel that if the Committee of the Whole is to move forward in its work, as we hope it will, there must be some spirit of give and take. The quickest and most impartial way to move our work along would be to select those mutually agreeable measures in each other's lists and then alternate discussion on them.

The United States delegation has proposed that the Committee of the Whole consider three measures in its work. One is a cut-off of production of fissionable materials for use in weapons. It seems to us that that is a very important item, because if there were a cut-off of production of fissionable materials there could not be any further production of weapons using such materials. The other items are: reduction of the possibility of war by surprise attack, miscalculation, or failure of communications; and measures to ensure that outer space will be used for peaceful purposes only. We are quite flexible on the order of priority in which these three items should be considered along with the items which have been or might be proposed by other States. We believe that, as our work proceeds, the Committee should consider each of these items proposed in turn rather than concentrate on the items proposed by any particular delegation.

In the course of our search for a mutually-acceptable item from our list of measures for consideration in the Committee of the Whole, we have examined very carefully a number of documents on such measures submitted by various governments to the United Nations and elsewhere. Paramount among these, of course, have been suggestions made by the Government of the other co-Chairman. In examining these proposals we looked in some detail at a most important and, we thought, significant document of the Soviet Union. I refer to the memorandum submitted by the Soviet Union to the General Assembly of the United Nations on 26 September 1961 (ENDC/14).

In this document of the Soviet Union a number of measures are suggested for consideration, including "Steps to decrease the danger of surprise attack". This measure corresponds very closely to the proposal of the United States on measures to reduce the possibility of war by surprise attack, miscalculation or failure of communications. In this connexion I should like to quote from the memorandum of the Soviet Government, because many things are said in it with which I, and I believe my colleagues, can agree. On 26 September 1961 the Government of the Soviet Union wrote to the Members of the United Nations as follows:

(Mr. Dean, United States)

"In its desire to eliminate the danger of the outbreak of war, the Soviet Union proposed as far back as in 1958 that certain specific steps for preventing surprise attack; which would greatly reduce the threat of the outbreak of war, should be agreed upon and put into effect." (ENDC/14, page 8)

There is apparently a great deal of agreement between ourselves and the Soviet Union, I am happy to say, on this measure. This is even more apparent after a closer comparison of the proposals of the United States and of the Soviet Union. For example, Secretary of State Rusk referred in his speech on 15 March, at our second plenary meeting, to four specific surprise attack proposals, one of which was the "establishment of observation posts at major ports, railway centres, motor highways, river crossings and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces." (ENDC/PV.2, page 22) The Soviet memorandum of September 1961 states:

"The most practical steps which can be taken at an early date include the setting up of land control posts at railway junctions and major ports and on motor roads, the function of which would be to ensure that dangerous concentrations of armed forces and military equipment did not take place." (ENDC/14, page 9)

It is, I think, apparent that there is a wide measure of agreement on at least one of the surprise attack measures proposed by both the United States and the Soviet Union. With discussion of this topic, that degree of agreement, I submit, can be built upon and expanded. It is a little difficult for me to understand why the Soviet representatives do not wish to agree to an early discussion of this impartial and substantive measure which the Soviet Union itself proposed for consideration. Therefore not only would this be a good item to discuss but it would seem to me that there would be a good possibility of reaching early agreement on it.

It is my hope that my Soviet colleague will shortly be able to clarify the position of his Government on this proposal. The Soviet Government has on a number of occasions, as I am sure all members are aware, expressed certain fears of surprise attack and of war by miscalculation. This fear seems to be very widespread among all peoples and all governments. My Government is also concerned about these problems. We hope that a discussion and the adoption and implementation of appropriate measures will serve to allay such fears as the Soviet Union has expressed.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

With this brief discussion of the measures now before us which we hope will be taken up in the Committee of the Whole, and of the reasons for the proposals made by the United States delegation to the Soviet co-Chairman, I hope we shall be able to agree on these items and move forward in the Committee of the Whole. Certainly in the spirit of true compromise which we showed in agreeing to the discussion of the question of the cessation of war propaganda, it would seem to me that an item put forward by my delegation should be considered as the next item by the Committee of the Whole.

Apparently both sides have agreed that it is necessary to take action to reduce the possibility of war by surprise attack, miscalculation or failure of communications. I hope it will be possible to agree on this as the next item for discussion by the Committee of the Whole.

Let me assure the Conference that I am meeting at appropriate intervals with the other co-Chairman. I am very happy to meet with him and to examine these matters. I hope very much that we shall be able to report some agreement to the Conference. We have been meeting on the question of the cessation of war propaganda. In fact, we met on that item yesterday afternoon and are to meet again on it this afternoon. I can assure members that our colleagues here dispose of the time of their two co-Chairmen very well indeed.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): We have indeed held a number of discussions with our colleague, the representative of the United States, on all the questions relating to preparations for the next meeting of the Committee of the Whole, but unfortunately we have so far been unable to reach agreement on the questions to be recommended for priority discussion. I would draw the Committee's attention to document ENDC/C.I/2 of 2 April, which contains a list of the questions submitted by various delegations for study and discussion in the Committee of the Whole, and would remind you that the Soviet delegation proposed that first priority should be given to the following questions: "Establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe", "Measures to prevent further dissemination of nuclear weapons" and "Conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO countries and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty." These are the three questions which we consider to be the most urgent and on which we believed and still believe we can reach mutually-acceptable decisions that might usefully be adopted by the whole Committee.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

We still take this view. Our approach to this matter is not determined by which delegation proposed a given topic and at what time. It is determined by the substance of each question and by the potential value of its discussion in the Committee. You see, we do not think there is any point in discussing a question merely for the sake of discussing it. We consider that the following types of problems should be recommended for discussion: first, those which are urgent at the present time; secondly, those which a sufficient number of countries are in favour of discussing and on which there is therefore some basis for agreement; and thirdly, those on which there is a real prospect of agreement between ourselves and the United States, our co-Chairmen. We do not think any useful purpose would be served by discussing questions on which there is no general agreement and on which it would be difficult to reach a positive decision in the near future. This would prejudice the work of our Committee and would not really help to improve the international situation, which, according to the procedure of work adopted by the Committee on Disarmament, is one of the main tasks of the Committee of the Whole.

We therefore consider that, as soon as possible after we have discussed the cessation of war propaganda (and, incidentally, I cannot agree with the appraisal of that topic given by my colleague, the distinguished co-Chairman from the United States of America: that it is not urgent at the present time; I believe that appraisal to be incorrect), our best course would be to take up two other issues for which, first, there is substantial support from many States of the world, and on which, secondly, we think it possible to reach agreement, both between the United States of America and the Soviet Union, and between other countries participating in the work of the Committee.

These questions are the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe and measures to prevent further dissemination of nuclear weapons. On these two questions resolutions have already been adopted by the General Assembly at its most recent session, the sixteenth. Resolution 1652(XVI), concerning the establishment of a denuclearized zone in Africa, was adopted by an overwhelming majority of votes; and, with regard to measures to prevent further dissemination of nuclear weapons, the resolution submitted by Ireland was adopted unanimously (1665(XVI)) and the resolution proposed by Sweden was also adopted (1664(XVI)). We consider that there is a definite measure of agreement on these two subjects between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, and that we can adopt an agreed decision which will undoubtedly advance the work of our

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

whole Committee, create a favourable atmosphere for the solution of the main problem of general and complete disarmament, and lead to a definite lessening of international tension.

During our discussions as co-Chairmen we tried to find a compromise solution of this problem, and at our last meeting we proposed that the order of these two topics should be changed, "Measures to prevent further dissemination of nuclear weapons" being placed first and "Establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe" second. Our reason for making this proposal was that the two problems are related in substance since the establishment of nuclear-free zones is a specific measure against the further dissemination of nuclear weapons. Accordingly, we thought it possible to discuss these two questions concurrently and, so to speak, to conduct parallel debates on measures to prevent further dissemination of nuclear weapons and on a specific measure such as the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe.

We also bore in mind the fact that our Committee already has before it a concrete proposal (ENDC/C.I/1) submitted by the Government of the Polish People's Republic on the question of denuclearized zones in various parts of the globe. This already gives us a specific subject for discussion. We are convinced that concrete proposals will also be submitted to us on the question of measures to prevent further dissemination of nuclear weapons, and that these proposals could serve as a basis for an agreed decision, since we already have a unanimous opinion expressed in a General Assembly resolution. We thought that if we were to deal with these topics, the work of the Committee would be considerably advanced.

Unfortunately, however, we were unable to reach agreement on this matter. It was not entirely clear to us why the United States considered it inadvisable to discuss these topics in the Committee immediately, as a matter of priority. We did not in fact hear any serious objections from the United States delegation during our discussion of this problem; that delegation did not categorically object to either of these topics. Indeed, it even admitted that they are both important in present circumstances and that there is a measure of agreement on both of them in view of the existence of General Assembly resolutions on the subject. Nevertheless, when it was a question of making a joint recommendation that these two questions should be discussed, the United States would not agree and adopted an approach which seems to us to be purely formal: "we have accepted your question, now let us take our question". This is a formal approach.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Moreover, it is not quite correct even from a purely formal point of view, because the question of measures to prevent wider dissemination of nuclear weapons is not, strictly speaking our question only. Why only ours? It is a question that is being raised by a large number of countries, one of which is a member of our Committee, namely Sweden. Sweden referred to it in a statement here. There is a General Assembly resolution and a large number of governments have expressed their views. Forty-four have already replied to the inquiry which the Secretary-General has made into the matter at the request of the General Assembly. Therefore we cannot understand why this question should be regarded as ours alone. Furthermore, Mr. Rusk, in his first statement on 15 March, included among the four matters that should be given high priority the proposal:

"that steps be taken to prevent States owning nuclear weapons from relinquishing control of such weapons to any nation not owning them". (ENDC/PV.2, page 23).

Therefore, if we are considering whose question this actually is, the answer is that it is also a question of the United States. That is how I understand the situation. Therefore we are proposing a question which has the support of all members of our Committee, since all members have voted in favour of the resolution on the subject. Why then should we object to discussing this question as a matter of first priority?

Where denuclearized zones are concerned, I have already stated that this question too is not exclusively our question, but one which has received the support of the General Assembly.

These are our views on the substance of what the United States representative has said.

Now a few words on the ideas and arguments he put forward in connexion with measures to reduce the possibility of war by surprise attack, miscalculation or failure of communications. He also mentioned other subjects suggested by his delegation during our discussion of the Committee's procedure of work.

Of the eight first priority questions previously listed in the Soviet Government's memorandum dealing with these separate measures (ENDC/14), we have suggested that first priority should be given to the four which I have already mentioned, namely, the cessation of war propaganda, the establishment of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe, measures to prevent further dissemination of nuclear weapons and the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the NATO

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

countries and the countries of the Warsaw Treaty. We deliberately did not propose that first priority should be given to the question of reducing the possibility of war by surprise attack. Why? Because we realize -- and we did so as far back as 1958 during the discussion of this question at a special conference, at which the representatives of a number of countries, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Poland, Romania and other countries participated -- that our approach to this matter is entirely different from that of the United States and that there are difficulties in reconciling our positions. To give this question first priority now would simply be to embark on a discussion of our differences. I do not think that this would be conducive to the success of our work as a whole and that is why we have not proposed that this question should be given first priority. Our positions here differ and these differences have become particularly marked now that the views of the United States on the matter have been clearly set out in the statement by Mr. Rusk and in the explanations given by the United States delegation. We realize that we are even further apart on this question than we were in 1958.

Therefore, to insist on a discussion of this matter would, in our view, not only not promote the success of our work, but would even be detrimental to it. Why should we propose a question on which we already know divergencies exist and on which it seems unlikely that we can achieve a unanimous decision in the present circumstances? Why should we raise such a question - what for? Merely to inflame passions? I do not think that this would help to strengthen peace and lessen international tension. Our Committee should concern itself with matters that would be conducive to lessening international tension. This is what the Committee of the Whole is supposed to do. This is why we objected to giving the question first priority at the present time. I think these views deserve the attention of the Committee, and I felt it necessary to give this explanation in view of the comments just made by the United States representative.

We are in favour of working effectively to reconcile our positions on these matters on which we can reach a positive decision here and now. I think that in the interests of world peace we should concern ourselves with measures to prevent the further dissemination of nuclear weapons. We are in a position to adopt such measures and to reach agreed positions on this problem, which I think would be to the advantage not only of our countries but of all the countries of the world. A constructive solution of this problem would undoubtedly help to strengthen peace and improve relations between countries. The same applies to the question

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

of establishing nuclear-free zones in various parts of the globe. I frankly admit that our views may differ on some aspects of this question; we are perfectly aware of that. But in addition to differences, we also have something in common. The actual principle of establishing denuclearized zones has already been confirmed by the General Assembly with regard to a specific area, namely Africa.

Therefore, there is already a measure of agreement among us on the principle involved and it seems to us that we must increase this measure of agreement and try at least to give concrete effect to the general provisions contained in the General Assembly resolution relating to a denuclearized zone in Africa, try to develop this idea of denuclearized zones at least at a general theoretical level or through further negotiations, as provided for, incidentally, in the proposal submitted by the delegation of the Polish People's Republic. It seems to us that this would be a useful step and one which is closely connected with measures for preventing the further dissemination of nuclear weapons.

These are the ideas by which the Soviet delegation was guided in discussing this matter with our co-Chairman, Mr. Dean. I think that most, if not all members of the Committee will agree that measures to prevent the further dissemination of nuclear weapons and the establishment of denuclearized zones in various parts of the globe deserve to be discussed as questions of the first priority.

Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (translation from French): I should like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether you now propose to have an exchange of views on the situation that has arisen with regard to the agenda of the Committee of the Whole. I think that such an exchange of views would be useful. If you agree, I have some comments to make.

The CHAIRMAN (India): We have another half-hour, and we should use it profitably. We could go on to exchange views on this matter. I would, in that case, give the floor in due course to the representative of Poland. But I think we should first decide what we are going to do tomorrow, and we can then come back to this question. I recognize the representative of the United States on the question of what we should do tomorrow.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I would suggest that we have a plenary meeting tomorrow on general and complete disarmament. The representative of the Soviet Union made some very pertinent and interesting comments on this question, and at the time I said I would very much like to reply in some detail at a plenary meeting on Wednesday. I would therefore very much like to have a plenary meeting on general and complete disarmament tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN (India): It is proposed that we discuss general and complete disarmament tomorrow, taking into account the statements which have been made on controls and on that subject generally. I think that will probably occupy us at our meeting tomorrow, so let us now discuss our future programme in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I apologise for interrupting you, but I consider it necessary to make a brief statement on the suggestion which has just been made. We have basically no objection to devoting tomorrow to the discussion of questions connected with general and complete disarmament. I should only like to remind you that, in view of the proposal submitted yesterday by the eight non-aligned countries (ENDC/28), we should give a little thought to planning our future work, bearing in mind that everyone apparently wishes our meeting the day after tomorrow to be the last this week. In view of this, we must somehow arrange to discuss this question before the recess, because Easter may bring not only good tidings, but bad tidings too. I think that we should find some way of considering the proposal submitted by the eight non-aligned countries before Easter. I merely feel that this is something we must keep in mind; we shall evidently make a final decision tomorrow on the procedure we are to follow. I have no objection to a meeting tomorrow, nor to using the time which remains for an exchange of views on the question which has just been raised.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): Since the representative of the Soviet Union has touched on the question of the Easter recess, I hope it will be all right if I say something about that. He and I did discuss this question and since, as I understand it -- and I am subject to correction -- Friday and Monday are holidays for the Secretariat, we thought that the Conference might adjourn

(Mr. Dean, United States)

after our meeting on Thursday and reconvene on Tuesday, 24 April. My co-Chairman and I did not reach a definite agreement on this. We thought it might be brought up yesterday. Since a number of delegation members have asked me what the plans are, so that they may make reservations, this might be an appropriate time to discuss what the Conference wishes to do with respect to the Easter recess.

The CHAIRMAN (India): The suggestion is that we work on Thursday and that our next meeting after that be on Tuesday, 24 April. Is that acceptable? I hear no objections.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I do not, of course, wish to destroy the general agreement which apparently exists on this matter, but I still think that we could take a final decision on this a little later on, because it seems to me that issues arise before Easter that are too important to be settled in terms of our holiday plans. Therefore I think it would not be wise to take any final decision now, but to come back to the matter tomorrow or the day after tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN (India): I thought there was no objection to the proposal which had been made. However, we can perhaps say that we will come back to this question but that, tentatively at any rate, it is the feeling of the Conference that there should be this recess.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I do not, of course, wish to pursue the matter if my Soviet colleague does not agree, but a number of people have come to me to say that they might not be able to get reservations if a decision were not made. As I am sure you all know, this is one of the great holiday seasons, a season of rejoicing in some of the great religions of the world, and many people like to spend these days with their families. I am told that this is a holiday in the European Office of the United Nations and that a number of the personnel here have asked if we could make this decision at a somewhat earlier date so that they may be able to go ahead with their plans. I am not pursuing the matter for myself because it makes no difference to me, but there are a number of people here for whom an earlier decision would, I am sure, be more convenient.

The CHAIRMAN (India): If there are no other speakers on this point, I suggest that we take it as the tentative decision that we do not meet from Friday through Monday, and we can come back to this question later. I see the representative of the Soviet Union nodding, and that will be recorded.

We will now spend a few minutes on the question of what to do next in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NASZKOWSKI (Poland) (translation from French): We have learnt from the report of our co-Chairmen that the next item on the agenda of the Committee of the Whole has not yet been agreed on. We have also learnt that one of the co-Chairmen, the representative of the United States, is opposed to the Polish proposal (ENDC/C.I/1) that the second item to be dealt with should be the establishment of a denuclearized zone in Europe. May I be allowed, therefore, to make a few remarks about our proposal?

When we submitted for consideration by the Committee of the Whole our proposal for the establishment of a denuclearized and limited armaments zone in Europe, we started out from the realistic principle that priority in our work should be given to the problems which are ripe for solution, and whose solution can help to increase international security and facilitate general and complete disarmament.

The wide support given to the idea of denuclearized zones in general, and to the application of this idea in Europe, has found expression in the discussions in our Committee and also in the replies of numerous States to the enquiry made by the Acting Secretary-General of the United Nations, as the result of a proposal by Sweden concerning the formation of a "non-nuclear club".

It must be emphasized that even those States which still oppose, not only the idea presented in the Polish plan but also, generally speaking, its discussion, have declared their willingness to consider this question during the disarmament negotiations. As I have already had occasion to say, such willingness was expressed, among others, by President Kennedy, in his statement of 8 March, and by the Government of the United States in its reply of 12 March to the enquiry by the Acting Secretary-General (DC/201/Add.2).

On the proposal of several African countries, the United Nations General Assembly, as Mr. Zorin has already reminded us today, adopted a resolution designed to make Africa a denuclearized zone, and it must be pointed out here that no State voted against that resolution.

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

All these considerations strengthen the conviction of the Polish delegation that it is right to ask for priority for the examination of its proposal.

Let us now look at another aspect of the matter: that of the basis for the proposal. I will not repeat here in full the arguments already advanced by Mr. Rapacki, the Polish Minister for Foreign Affairs, when he submitted the memorandum (ENDC/C.I/PV.1, page 5). I only wish to stress a few points which show the soundness and effectiveness of our plan.

The Polish plan provides for denuclearization and the limitation of conventional armaments in the territories bordering on the countries of the two groups - NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization - that is to say the territories where the danger of an armed conflict breaking out and the danger of its turning into a nuclear world war are particularly great. There are two reasons for this danger. The first is the enormous concentration of various types of modern armaments in these territories - nuclear weapons, rockets, aircraft etc. The second is the growth of dangerous tendencies in one of the States of Central Europe, in particular, the development of militarism and of revanchist aspirations against other States on the part of the Federal Republic of Germany which, in the light of experience and of the history of this region, must cause particular anxiety.

I do not intend to speak now about the basic characteristics of the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany or the direction in which it is developing. I merely wish to emphasize the facts which are linked with the problem I am discussing. The essential element here is the fact that the Federal Republic has for several years been demanding that it be given nuclear weapons, either direct or through diverse variants of the idea of transforming NATO into a nuclear Power. The statement by Chancellor Adenauer on 10 April in which he observed that the question of equipping NATO with nuclear weapons was "of the greatest importance" was a fresh expression of this same tendency.

The opposition of the Government of the Federal Republic to the Polish proposal, expressed on 6 April by the spokesman of the Bonn Government is nothing new. There is, moreover, an edifying concordance between the arguments of the Federal Government and those advanced by the State Department on 3 April. But what is even more characteristic is the demand for the right of veto against any future plans to withdraw -- I repeat "withdraw" -- nuclear weapons from the territory of the Federal Republic.

(Mr. Naszkowski, Poland)

On 6 April, during a debate in the Bundestag, Mr. Strauss, the Minister for Defence of the Federal Republic of Germany, in addition to the previous demand for participation in any decision to use nuclear weapons, made two further demands: first, that the United States inform the Federal Republic of the quantity of nuclear weapons kept in the territory of Western Germany; and secondly, that the Federal Republic be given the right of veto in respect of any decision on the withdrawal by the United States of various nuclear units or installations from the territory of Western Germany.

Thus, while an increasing number of States are anxious that nuclear weapons should not be admitted to their territory, the Federal Republic of Germany is fighting for the right to prevent these weapons from being withdrawn from its territory. I think this comparison could hardly speak more eloquently.

Up to now I have been speaking of the plan for a denuclearized zone in Europe presented in the Polish proposal. But the arguments which I have advanced also apply, to a greater or lesser degree, to the establishment of similar zones in other parts of the world. That is why the Polish delegation, which has submitted a practical memorandum on the establishment of such a zone in Europe, considers it possible to examine this question together with other proposals for denuclearized zones, as suggested by the representative of the Soviet Union during the co-Chairmen's talks.

I should also like to draw attention to the fact that our memorandum provides that the Eighteen Nation Committee may recommend the States concerned to take appropriate measures to establish such a zone. It also provides that a group of States or delegations may hold preliminary talks with the States concerned. We think that a similar procedure could be applied in regard to the establishment of other zones.

Lastly, I should also like to say that, in order to take the wishes of certain delegations into account, we think it would be possible to examine the question of denuclearized zones together with that of preventing further dissemination of nuclear weapons, as associated items.

Mr. GODBER (United Kingdom): I would not wish to follow the representative of Poland in what he has just been saying, because I do not want to get drawn into a discussion of the substance of any particular proposal, since what we are debating now, as I understand it, is a purely procedural matter. I therefore wish to withhold substantive discussion until the matter is being debated.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

I listened to the speeches of both the co-Chairmen on this matter, and I must say I was a little surprised at the attitude adopted by the representative of the Soviet Union in regard to our procedure in selecting these subjects for discussion. I think the basic point here is that we all realize that these various subjects should in due course be discussed in the Committee of the Whole. We have had discussion on one already; there are six more in document ENDC/C.I/2. What we are really concerned with now is merely the order in which they should be taken. Our United States colleague made the point -- and I think it was a valid point -- that, since we accepted one subject from the list of the Soviet Union to discuss first, it would be only reasonable that a suggestion put forward by the other co-Chairman should be taken next in order. The representative of the Soviet Union did not seem willing to adopt this suggestion. He did, however, at one stage in his speech, say that he had endeavoured to achieve a compromise and, as I understand it -- and I hope he will correct me if I am wrong -- the compromise which he suggested was to change the order of the items in his own list. Well, to him that may appear to be a fair compromise but, frankly, to me it does not. A compromise, I would have thought, would be to agree that we are to discuss all these matters and that we should take them in turn, one from one list and one from another. I would have thought that this was something so eminently fair as to commend itself to the Conference as a whole.

As I understood the argument of the representative of the Soviet Union, he was saying that one particular subject which was mentioned by the representative of the United States, the question of surprise attack, was not a suitable one to discuss at an early stage because we were unlikely to agree upon it. I would agree with Mr. Zorin to this extent: that we certainly want to choose those subjects first on which there is the greatest likelihood of agreement. But it was for this reason that I myself had hoped very much that the question of surprise attack would be one which commended itself. The representative of the United States reminded us that it was included in the list of eight points submitted by Mr. Gromyko at the last session of the General Assembly. After listening to Mr. Zorin, I referred to the document in which this was submitted. I notice that it is stated in that document:

"each of these measures individually and all of them in combination should help to create a situation conducive to the conclusion and effective application of such a treaty [on general and complete disarmament]. Along with the consideration of the disarmament problem as a whole and of

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

several other important international problems, steps can and must be taken towards the adoption of a number of simple decisions, comprehensible to millions of people, which would lessen the danger of the outbreak of war and on which States might reach agreement in the immediate future."

(ENDC/14, page 2)

This is what Mr. Gromyko submitted to the United Nations on 26 September 1961. Therefore I was very puzzled by Mr. Zorin's references to what happened in 1958; he said to us this morning: "We observed that we had completely different approaches". We may have found that in 1958, but in 1961, three years later, this was one of the eight proposals Mr. Gromyko put forward, and he seemed to think that it was one on which we could now reach agreement. I would have thought that this would help us to come to a decision on this matter; that, if in fact in 1961 the Soviet Union felt that this was one of those subjects, then they would still feel so. Therefore the reference to the discussion in 1958 seemed to be not exactly to the point.

However, while, as I say, I would have thought this was one of the subjects on which we could have a useful discussion at an early date, I only suggest it as one of them. I remember very clearly that the Foreign Minister of Canada made an impassioned plea to us when he was here that we should discuss the question of outer space. That is yet another question. There is also the question of the production of fissionable materials. These are matters which, I think, are all deserving of discussion. I do not deny that the other matters also are deserving of discussion, but, merely in order to facilitate our work, I would have thought it would be fair for us to take alternately from one list and then from another. But, if Mr. Zorin argues, as I understood him to argue, that we should take only those matters on which there was agreement initially, then I think that this question of the establishment of nuclear-free zones would not necessarily commend itself as being the very first to be taken up. When the Foreign Minister of Poland brought forward this proposal, on 28 March, I myself said, in referring to Mr. Rapacki's proposals:

"I would say at once that certain clear difficulties do emerge which

I think it would be wrong to cloak." (ENDC/C.I/PV.1, page 34)

I went on to develop this point. I made it clear from the beginning that there were difficulties here. So that must be apparent to our Soviet colleague. Therefore I would not have recommended this necessarily as the first subject, though I recognize it is one which we should discuss in the Committee of the Whole at some stage.

(Mr. Godber, United Kingdom)

Really all we are considering is the priorities, and I must say that I was not convinced by the arguments used by the Soviet representative in this regard. I would very much hope that our co-Chairmen, following on the progress we have made in other spheres this morning, might get together again and consider these matters once more. If they could agree to take these alternately, that would certainly commend itself to me. I think it would conform to a general feeling of "fair shares", if I might put it in that way, on both sides. I hope that will be possible, because I think it is important that we should spend some portion of our time in these discussions in the Committee of the Whole on some of these valuable matters, while at the same time spending a very considerable proportion of our time on our primary task of the treaty as a whole.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): The position of the Italian delegation regarding the subject which we have been discussing was very clearly defined by Mr. Segni, the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, when he spoke at the Conference on 28 March (ENDC/C.I/PV.1, page 9). Mr. Segni stressed his desire that certain special measures should be worked out as soon as possible in order to advance the work of the Conference, and mentioned three questions which he thought should be given priority: the de-militarization of outer space, the cessation of the military use of fissionable materials, and measures against surprise attacks.

We are not opposed to the discussion of any other measures, or any other proposals, least of all those formulated by the Soviet delegation and the Polish delegation. I can assure Mr. Naszkowski that we are not at all opposed to discussing, at a certain stage in our deliberations, the proposals and ideas he mentioned today. But what we have to do now is to establish an order of priority for our work. At present, the Italian delegation can only confirm the desire expressed by our Minister at earlier meetings. It is impossible to go into the merits of our proposals now; these matters are not on the agenda, and it would not be proper to do so. We intend to revert to the proposals we have made, and I hope we shall have an opportunity of showing their very great importance and the advantages which could result from urgent consideration of these questions.

On the other hand, as Mr. Godber has just said, it seems right that after examining the question of the cessation of war propaganda proposed by the Soviet delegation, the Committee of the Whole should now consider as its second item one

(Mr. Cavalletti, Italy)

proposed by the Western delegations, namely, measures against surprise attacks. I should accordingly like to endorse Mr. Godber's proposal that the two co-Chairmen should reconsider the question and make a fresh effort to reach agreement.

The CHAIRMAN (India): It is now 1 o'clock, and I think we might end the meeting on the note proposed by Mr. Godber and supported by the representative of Italy, namely that the two co-Chairmen should re-examine this question in the light of the remarks that have been made today.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique

"The Conference of the Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its twenty-second meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the Chairmanship of Mr. A.S. Lall, the representative of India.

"The representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, Italy, Romania, the United Kingdom, India, Burma and Poland made statements.

"The co-Chairmen (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America) have reached, with the exceptions indicated in brackets, agreement on the preamble to the treaty which the Committee is drafting (ENDC/L.11/Rev.1). The Committee approved the working draft preamble as so far developed by the co-Chairmen.

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Wednesday, 18 April 1962, at 10 a.m."

The meeting rose at 1.5 p.m.